From: Craig Mundie (Xenix)
Sent: Wednesday, February 28, 1996 5:54 PM
To: Brad Silverberg
Subject: FW: Intel Frank Gill meeting: Security

FYI. No action required on your part now. Just in your space so I wanted you to see status of Intel discussions. Paulma is driving discussion with Gill/Intel.

From: Marshall Brumer
To: Paul Maritz; Sanjay Parthasarathy
Cc: Hank Vigil; Jim Kelly (NT Security); Rob Price; Allan Cooper; Barb Fox; Craig Mundie; Pradyumna Misra; Tom Johnston
Subject: RE. Intel Frank Gill meeting: Security
Date: Wednesday, February 28, 1996 5:44PM

X-Received: from xmtp6 by red-40-msg with receive; Wed, 28 Feb 1996 17:57:32 -0800
X-Received: from RED-02-IMC by xmtp6 with recvsmtp; Wed, 28 Feb 1996 17:53:52 -0800
Received: by red-02-imc.itg.microsoft.com with Microsoft Exchange (IMC 4.0.822)
id <01BB0605.BD6EF7F0@red-02-imc.itg.microsoft.com>; Wed, 28 Feb 1996 17:54:00 -0800
Message-ID:
<c=US%a=_%p=msft%l=RED-10-MSG960228174424OS008900@red-02-imc.itg.microsoft.com>
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
<c=US%a=_%p=msft%l=RED-10-MSG960228174424OS008900@red-02-imc.itg.microsoft.com>
X-Mailer: Microsoft Exchange Server Internet Mail Connector Version 4.0.822
Encoding: 107 TEXT, 86 UUENCODE
X-MS-Attachment: WINMAIL.DAT 0 00-00-1980 00:00
X-MsXMTID: xmtp6960229015352RECVSMTP[01.52.00]00000091-1197

TomJ and I spoke to George Cox and P.S. Kohli today to deliver the 4 main points below. They both heard these clearly and understood them. Their short message was that they would work to do all the things we suggest in 2 and 3 BUT will still recommend to their management that they still move forward on their own architecture.

They positioned this as a necessary thing since they already have a .9 spec out in the industry and cannot just pull back now. This was delivered at the RSA conf and we had asked them not to do this since we had not jointly agreed on the spec. At the time, they felt they could easily redirect. Now this seems to not be the case. They could not articulate specific business goals that our solution was not meeting.

I think that their real goal in here is to get some of their code into our release. I think this is standard IAL type work going on, rather than something to meet their real business goals. They think that since they already have a rev 0.9 that they must ship and the industry will demand since they have already spoken about it to the industry.

I recommend that we keep our current position and hammer Gill on the fact that a battle makes no sense in this area. Both MS and Intel will look better by getting behind a single, unified architecture that has the best of both companies work, rather than publicly battling in this space. I think that the conferencing space has many parallels here and we can use some of those in our arguments.

From: Sanjay Parthasarathy (Xenix)
Sent: Tuesday, February 27, 1996 8:10 AM
To: Paul Maritz (Exchange)
Cc: Hank Vigil (Xenix); Jim Kelly (NT Security); Marshall Brumer; Rob Price; Allan Cooper (Xenix); Barb Fox (Xenix); Craig Mundie (Xenix); Pradyumna Misra (Exchange); Tom Johnston (Xenix)
Subject: Intel Frank Gill meeting: Security

PENGAD-Bayonne, N.J.
GOVERNMENT EXHIBIT
286

Paul,

Marshall, Tom, Allan and I met yesterday. Here's our recommendation =
for the Frank Gill meeting. Appended is a more complete picture, =
including recent and past history on this subject.

IAL has made a major investment in people in this space. We=92d rather =
have them supporting our efforts than competing with us. At the same =
time, we don=92t want to delay our projects by investing critical =
resources into meeting with them very often, or pick up elements of =
their architecture which don=92t work for us.

1. After reviewing Intel=92s efforts we do not believe that Intel has =
much software technology to offer us. They expect us to take some of =
their code and reconfigure our architecture to fit their work. This is =
unacceptable and unwarranted. We need to be hardcore that our security =
architecture is complete and moving along briskly to implementation.

2. We should position our architecture as accomplishing IAL=92s goals - =
which it does. We can agree to continue drilling down on our =
architectures (max 1 per month depending on their commitment) and =
providing IAL early copies of specs and incorporating feedback that =
makes sense.

3. We should request IAL drops their plans for Intel architecture =
specific toolkits. Rather, IAL can do several things to work with our =
architecture, including:

- developing CSP=92s for CryptoAPI (both hardware and software)
- writing a PCT layered service provider, using CryptoAPI, WinTrust =
and WinCert to enhance other IAL/Intel applications
- writing a Trust Provider
- working with WinNT on SecureBoot
- developing policy modules for our certificate server and more.

4. We also need to get IAL to kill WinSec.

5. The above four messages can be softened at our discretion by doing =
the following:

- suggesting Intel help us with the SmartCard effort by driving the =
hardware efforts
- suggesting we make a joint announcement that Intel supports MS=92 =
security architecture (this should be combined with items 3 and 4 above)

<<File: INTELSEC.DOC>>

MS98_0172017
CONFIDENTIAL